

tail-feathers as whitish, an appearance not shown in any of the specimens examined by me, which have been as follows :—

E Mus. Brit.

- a.* [♀] ad. sk. Malacca. India Museum. [Horsf. & Moore, Cat. p. 678.]
b, c. [♂ ad.] sk. Malacca (*W. Harvey*).
d. [♂ ad.] sk. Malacca (*Hugh Cuming*).
e. ♀ ad. sk. Mount Ophir, Malacca (*A. R. Wallace*).
f. ♂ ad. sk. Sumatra (*A. R. Wallace*).
g, h. [♂ ♀ ad.] sk. N.W. Borneo (*H. Low*).
i. Juv. sk. N.W. Borneo (*H. Low*).

E. Mus. E. Hargitt.

- a* [♂], *b, c* [♀]. Sk. Borneo.
d. Juv. sk. N.W. Borneo (*Hugh Low*).
e, ♂ ; f, g, ♀ . Sk. N.W. Borneo (*Hugh Low*).

XVII.—*On some necessary Changes in the Nomenclature of South-American Birds.*—By HANS, Graf von BERLEPSCH.

ORNITHOLOGISTS will generally find me unwilling to change long-established nomenclature, especially when there is no other reason for doing so than to call into usage obscure old names which may have a slight advantage of priority, but in other respects had better be ignored. I mean such names as those of Müller, Boddaert, and others, which have only during the last few years come into usage, and have been called forth to supersede denominations which had become quite familiar to us, being founded on descriptions unmis-takably intended for the species bearing them. Nevertheless I am of opinion that we ought to change (or erase from our list) even the most familiar denomination if it can be proved that it was originally intended for another species, or if the description is so vague that it is quite impossible to say what bird the author of the name really meant by it.

In the following pages I propose to refer to some such, or similar, cases in which I believe it is necessary to change the names usually applied to certain species :—

1. "BASILEUTERUS VERMIVORUS (Vieill.)," auctt. plur.

The "Nouv. Dict. vol. ii. p. 278," is generally cited as the place where Vieillot's name "*vermivorus*" was first given to this species. But "vol. ii." is a misprint for "vol. xi." where a "*Sylvia vermivora*, Lath.," is described by Vieillot. It would appear that no author can have read Vieillot's description since the publication of Lafresnaye and d'Orbigny's 'Synopsis,' where, I think, the term *vermivorus* was first used for this *Basileuterus*, and referred to "vol. ii.," instead of "xi.," of the Nouv. Dict. Nevertheless Dr. Coues, in his most elaborate work on the Birds of the Colorado Valley (p. 212), is an exception. He gives correctly the synonym "*Sylvia vermivora*, Vieill. Nouv. Dict. xi. (1817) p. 278," and refers it to *Helmintherus vermivorus* (Gmel.), to which it strictly belongs. Vieillot (*l. c.*) begins as follows:—"Le Pitpit vermivore, *Sylvia vermivora*, Lath., pl. 305, des Oiseaux d'Edwards, se trouve dans la Pensylvanie;" and after having described the *Helmintherus* at full length, he continues, "c'est le 'demi-fin Mangeur de vers' de Buffon. Il paroît qu'il se trouve aussi au Paraguay, ou plutôt qu'il y existe une race voisine à laquelle M. de Azara rapporte le 'mangeur de vers,' qu'il appelle 'contre-mâitre couronné.' Il le décrit ainsi," &c.

Vieillot then describes the latter bird (which is certainly the same as the *Basileuterus vermivorus*, auct.) after Azara, without giving a name to it. It is therefore quite evident that Vieillot did not give to this *Basileuterus* a particular name, and that we must find another for it. The next name in priority seems to be *Setophaga auricapilla* of Swainson, Two Cent., &c., in 'Animals in Menageries' (1838), p. 293, sp. 41. (*Hab.* Mexico and Brazil.) Here our species is well described; and the name, which is chosen from its similarity in the coloration of the head to *Siurus auricapillus*, is not inappropriate. It follows that in future the *Basileuterus* usually termed *B. vermivorus* (Vieill.) must stand as *Basileuterus auricapillus* (Swains.).

2. DACNIS CAYANA (Linn.), auctt. plur.

The *Molacilla cayana* of Linnæus (Syst. Nat. ed. 12, i. p. 336)

is based on *Sylvia cayanaensis cærulea*, Briss. Orn. iii. p. 534, tab. 28. fig. 1. Further, the "*Elotototl*, Fernand. Mex. 54," is there given as a synonym of it. The diagnosis, "*M. cærulea* ; *capistro*, *humeris*, *alis caudaque nigris*," is evidently taken from Brisson's description. This in general agrees closely with the male of *Dacnis cayana* of authors ; but no mention is made (in the otherwise very full and long description) of the black throat, a characteristic feature of the male of that species. This omission has been the cause of Brisson's description being, by some authors, applied to *D. angelica*, Filippi, which has a blue throat, but otherwise does not at all answer to Brisson's description.

The consequence has been that great confusion has arisen, two species having been called *Dacnis cayana*, viz. *D. angelica*, Filippi, and *D. cyanomelas* (Gm.).

This alone would induce me to drop the name *cayana* altogether.

It is certainly true that we know no other bird to which Brisson's description is better applicable than the species which I call *D. cyanomelas* (Gm.) ; and therefore it might be assumed that Brisson intended to describe this species, and forgot to mention the black throat. This, however, is not very probable, as the description is long and full, and the plate also does not show any black on the throat. It may be, however, that his description belongs to a different species, differing from *D. cyanomelas* (Gm.) in possessing a blue (instead of black) throat, and one which has not been seen by naturalists since the days of Brisson, and perhaps is to be rediscovered in the interesting district of Cayenne, where many species exist which, though described by Brisson or Buffon, are now very scarce in collections. I do not say this is probable ; but it is not quite impossible ; and, for the sake of having a well established nomenclature, it becomes necessary to avoid such denominations of that of *cayana*. Linn. It is hardly necessary to remark that the "*Elotototl*" of Fernandez (cited by Linnæus as a synonym of his *cayana*), being a Mexican bird, has nothing to do with our *Dacnis cyanomelas*.

Prof. Cabanis has already adopted the term *cyanomelas* of Gmelin for the *D. cayana* of authors; and I think he is quite right in doing so.

Fringilla cyanomelas, Gm. Syst. Nat. (ed. xiii. 1788) p. 924, no. 93, is based on Koelreuter's "*Fringilla cærulea, mento, gula etc. nigris*," described in Nov. Comment. Petrop. xi. (1767) p. 434, and figured there, tab. 15. fig. 6 (no locality given). Koelreuter's description and plate accurately represent the *D. cayana* auctt. (which I know from having carefully studied it), and has nothing to do with *Cæreba cærulea*, to which Mr. Cassin (Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philad. 1864, p. 266) incorrectly refers it.

Finally, I may remark that "Blue Manakin," Edwards, pl. 263, and *Dacnis nigripes*, Cass. (nec Pelz.), Proc. Acad. Philad. 1864, p. 269, are also synonyms of *D. cyanomelas* (Gm.)*, and have nothing to do with *D. nigripes*, Pelz., which is quite distinct from it.

3. *DACNIS PLUMBEA* (Lath.), auctt. plur., ought to be called *D. bicolor* (Vieill.).

I scarcely need repeat on this subject what Cassin (Proc. Acad. Philad. 1864, p. 270) has pointed out, that Latham's very short description (without any indication of locality) of his *Sylvia plumbea* is barely applicable to this species of *Dacnis*, for which Vieillot's name "*bicolor*" (first published in 1807, Ois. Am. Sept. ii. p. 32, pl. 90. figs. 1 & 2, and then in Nouv. Dict. xi. p. 167, where "Amérique Sept. et Cayenne" is given as the habitat) should be used.

4. *CHLOROPHANES ATRICAPILLA* (Vieill.), auctt. plur., ought to be called *C. spiza* (Linn.).

In regard to this species I shall proceed in the contrary direction and propose to bestow an old name upon a bird now mostly called by Vieillot's denomination. As an apology for so doing, I may remark that the Linnæan appellation

* I have worked out very carefully the synonymy of this and other species of *Cœrebidæ*, it having been at one time my intention to prepare a monograph of this family. The synonymy of some of the species is very intricate.

has been, and is now, often used for this species, and that I see no ground whatever for rejecting it.

Motacilla spiza, Linn., was first published in the tenth edition of the 'Systema Naturæ,' and was based on the upper figure of Edwards's pl. 25, which closely represents our *Chlorophanes*. The lower figure on the same plate, which Edwards thought to represent the female of the other bird (but which is certainly the female of *Dacnis cyanomelas*) is given as a variety β in the twelfth edition, where the species is called *Certhia spiza*. A diagnosis is given which strictly refers to our *Chlorophanes*; but, as synonyms, are added:—

1. *Motacilla spiza*, Linn. Syst. Nat. ed. 10.

2. *Certhia Cras. virid. atricap.* p. 635 (which is our *Chlorophanes*).

3. Edwards, tab. 25. figs. 1, 2 (fig. 2 being *Dacnis cyanomelas*).

Hab. Brazil and Surinam.

It is thus evident that "*Certhia spiza*, Linn." is chiefly intended for the *Chlorophanes*, only the synonym "Edwards, fig. 2" belonging to another species, and that the species must be called *Chlorophanes spiza* (Linn.).

5. *PROCNIAS TERSA* (Linn.), auct. plur., ought to be called *P. cærulea* (Vieill.).

Although I do not know to what other species Linnæus's description of his *Ampelis tersa*, Syst. Nat. ed. xii. p. 289, refers than to *P. tersa* of authors, everybody must concede that it is hardly applicable to it. *P. tersa* never has any black on the back, and in some other points also does not agree satisfactorily with Linnæus's description.

The latter seems not, as in most other cases, to be copied from a more full description of some other author, but must have been drawn up from a specimen. Where this type exists is not stated; and unless it is found, which is very improbable, the determination of *Ampelis tersa*, Linn., must remain very doubtful.

"*Hirundo viridis*, Temm.," and "*Procnias ventralis*, Illig.,"

often cited for this species, seem never to have been published. Temminck only describes a *Hirondelle verte*; and Illiger does not mention his name (which was certainly bestowed upon the present species in the Berlin Museum) when he establishes the genus *Procnias* (Prodr. p. 228), but only cites "*Hirundo viridis*, Temm."

Therefore *Procnias carulea* (Vieill.), Nouv. Dict. xxxiii. (1819) p. 401 (Brésil et Pérou), seems to be the correct appellation for this bird.

6. *THAMNOPHILUS ATRICAPILLUS* (Gmel.), auctt. plur., ought to be called *Th. cirrhatus* (Gmel.).

The oldest name for this species is certainly *Lanius canadensis*, Linn. (Syst. Nat. ed. xii. p. 134), based on Brisson, Orn. ii. p. 171, tab. xviii. fig. 3 (Canada), which represents clearly the female of our species. But I do not like to employ this name, as it is geographically erroneous.

The *Lanius atricapillus* of Gmelin (Syst. Nat. ed. xiii. p. 302. sp. 32) is based mainly on Merrem, Av. Icones et Descr. p. 26, Taf. viii., which is not at all the *atricapillus* of authors, but without doubt the species now generally called *T. navius* (Gmel.) *.

The next name given to *Th. atricapillus*, auctt. (nec Gmel.), is *Turdus cirrhatus*, Gmel. S. N. p. 826. sp. 91, based on the *Fourmilier huppé* of Buff., Hist. Nat. Ois. p. 476, which is

* If we are forced so strictly to follow the rules of the Stricklandian code (to which I otherwise shall render the highest respect) even where they prove to be unsatisfactory or unpractical, as a learned Professor at Cambridge seems to think, we shall be driven to the unpleasing necessity of calling the *Th. navius* (Gm.) in future *Th. atricapillus* (Merrem), the latter name having a priority of two years. But I do not at all like to transfer names from one species to another, such a practice being the source of great confusion and general misunderstanding. For instance, I shall never accept the practice of some English authors who now call our old friend *Calamoherpe arundinacea* "*C. strepera*, Vieill.," and *C. turdoides*, Meyer, "*C. arundinacea* (L.)," even should I be in danger of being called a "franc-tireur" (cf. Ibis, 1870, p. 513). I take this opportunity to express my full sympathy with what my friend Mr. Seebohm has said regarding this and some other points of nomenclature in 'The Ibis' for 1879.

certainly the species in question. The term *cirrhat* has already been used for this bird by Prof. Cabanis (cf. Schomb. Reise Brit. Guian. iii. p. 687, & Mus. Hein. ii. p. 16).

I may be allowed here to remark that the bird from Santa Marta which belongs to a closely allied species to *T. cirrhat*, or perhaps should be termed a subspecies, is not entitled to bear the name *T. leucauchen*, ScL. (originally described as from the Upper Amazons), but that of *pulchellus*, Cab. et Heine, Mus. Hein. ii. p. 16 (well described from Cartagena). *T. pulchellus* differs from *T. cirrhat* in possessing a bright rufous back, more white in the otherwise black head, and a rusty suffusion on the flanks, and in showing a continuous white outer web on the outer tail-feathers (up to the white end). Venezuelan examples are somewhat intermediate between *T. cirrhat* and *T. pulchellus*, but agree better with the former.

The differences of *T. pulchellus* are not pointed out in the description of *T. leucauchen*, ScL.; and as *T. cirrhat* is also mentioned from the Upper Amazons by Selater and Salvin (P. Z. S. 1873, p. 273, sub *T. atricapillo*), I believe that *T. leucauchen* will prove to be only a synonym of it*.

On the other hand, *T. albinuchalis*, Selater, from Ecuador and Northern Peru (given also from New Granada by Cab. et Heine), is a very distinct and fine species, in no way to be confounded with *T. cirrhat*. There is a third species, allied to *T. cirrhat*, found at Bahia by the Prince of Wied, viz. *T. cristatus*, which is evidently well marked, but seems not to have been met with since its discovery by that illustrious traveller.

XVIII.—*Ornithological Letters from the Pacific*.—VII. *Nawodo (Pleasant Island)*. By OTTO FINSCH, Ph.D.,
H.M.B.O.U., &c.

Pacific Ocean, on board the German steamer
'Pacific.' July 29, 1880.

IT is my privilege to be today among the innumerable

* [*T. leucauchen* (from Upper Amazonia) is much nearer to *T. pulchellus* than to *T. cirrhat*; and if (as it seems to us) *T. leucauchen* and *T. pulchellus* are barely separable, the species must go by the former name, as oldest.
—EDD.]